# COMMISSIONERS BOB STUMP - Chairman GARY PIERCE BRENDA BURNS BOB BURNS SUSAN BITTER SMITH





#### ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

2014 JUN 30 P 2: 29

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

DATE:

JUNE 30, 2014

DOCKET NO.:

WS-02987A-08-0180

ORIGINAL

TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Teena Jibilian. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Opinion and Order on:

JOHNSON UTILITIES, LLC. (REHEARING OF DECISION NO. 73992)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by 4:00 p.m. on or before:

JULY 9, 2014

The enclosed is <u>NOT</u> an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has <u>tentatively</u> been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

JULY 22, 2014 and JULY 23, 2014

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602) 542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602) 542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Director's Office at (602) 542-3931.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 3 0 2014

DOCKETED BY

JODI JERICH

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET; PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2927 / 400 WEST CONGRESS STREET; TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1347 WWW.AZCC.QOV

This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Shaylin Bernal, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, E-mail <u>SABernal@azcc.gov</u>.

1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA C	CORPORATION COMMISSION
2	COMMISSIONERS	
3	BOB STUMP - Chairman GARY PIERCE	
4	BRENDA BURNS BOB BURNS	
5	SUSAN BITTER SMITH	
6	TO A TOWN A CONTROL OF THE A DRIVE A D	DOCUETAIO MIC 02007 A 00 0100
7	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF JOHNSON UTILITIES, LLC FOR AN	DOCKET NO. WS-02987A-08-0180
8	INCREASE IN ITS WATER AND WASTEWATER RATES FOR	DECISION NO
9	CUSTOMERS WITHIN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA.	OPINION AND ORDER ON REHEARING OF DECISION NO. 73992
10 11	DATE OF HEARING:	October 4 and December 5, 2013, January 30,
12		2014 (procedural conferences), and March 13, 2014 (rehearing)
13	PLACE OF HEARING:	Phoenix, Arizona
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	Teena Jibilian
15 16	APPEARANCES:	Mr. Jeffrey Crockett, BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP, on behalf of Johnson Utilities, LLC;
17		Mr. Daniel W. Pozefsky, Chief Counsel, on
18		behalf of the Residential Utility Consumer Office; and
19		Ms. Robin Mitchell, Staff Attorney, Legal Division, on behalf of the Utilities Division of
20		the Arizona Corporation Commission.
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

BY THE COMMISSION:

Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

#### **Background**

- 1. On March 31, 2008, Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company ("Johnson Utilities" or "Company") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application for an increase in its water and wastewater utility rates.
- 2. The parties to this docket are Johnson Utilities, Swing First Golf, LLC ("Swing First"), the Town of Florence ("Florence"), the Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO"), and the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff").<sup>1</sup>
- 3. On August 25, 2010, the Commission issued Decision No. 71854, approving new rates for Johnson Utilities.
- 4. On September 15, 2011, the Commission issued Decision No. 72579. Decision No. 72579 amended Decision No. 71854 by increasing the wastewater division's fair value rate base, adopting an 8.0 percent rate of return for the wastewater division, increasing the revenue requirement for the wastewater division and authorizing an increase in wastewater rates, authorizing new hook-up fee tariffs, and ordering that in the event of an alteration in the Commission policy that would allow S-corporation and LLC entities to impute a hypothetical income tax expense for ratemaking purposes, Johnson Utilities could file a motion to amend Decision No. 72579 prospectively to increase the Company's authorized revenue requirement to reflect the change in Commission policy.
- 5. On February 21, 2013, the Commission issued Decision No. 73739 in Docket No. W-00000C-06-0149. Decision No. 73739 adopted a policy which allows imputed income tax expense in the cost of service for limited liability companies, S-corporations, partnerships, and sole proprietorships. The policy states that it will be applied in pending and future rate cases, and that it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Only Johnson Utilities, RUCO, and Staff participated in the rehearing and post-hearing briefing.

allows companies previously denied recognition of income tax expense to make a filing under A.R.S. § 40-252 to modify the revenue requirement authorized in their most recent rate case in order to include income tax expense prospectively. The policy includes a 7-step protocol for determining income tax expense.

- 6. On March 8, 2013, the Company filed a petition to amend Decision No. 71854 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252, requesting that the Commission increase the Company's test year revenue requirement and rates to reflect the inclusion of income tax expense based upon the policy set forth in Decision No. 73739 ("Petition"). The Petition included information and schedules, and requested consideration and approval without a hearing, following verification of the information and schedules by Staff.
- 7. On April 4, 2013, RUCO filed a Response to the Petition, objecting to the Company's recovery of income tax expense and to the methodology proposed for calculating the expense amount.
- 8. On April 19, 2013, Swing First filed a Response to the Petition, asserting that the Petition should not be considered until the Company was in full compliance with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality requirements and existing issues with Swing First were resolved.
- 9. On April 26, 2013, Staff filed a Staff Report and Proposed Order recommending approval of the requested rate increase and associated rate design. Staff also recommended that the Company provide notice of the Petition via a special direct mailing to all of its customers and to all parties to the case, and that the Company be ordered to file a full rate case application for both its water and wastewater divisions by no later than June 30, 2015, using a calendar year 2014 test year.
- 10. On May 10, 2013, the Company filed an Affidavit of Mailing Public Notice indicating that it mailed a copy of notice of the Petition on or about May 7, 2013, in a special direct mailing to all of the Company's customers and to all parties on the service list for this docket, which indicated the effects that approval of the Petition would have on customers' rates. Numerous public comments were filed opposing the Petition.

- 11. On June 18, 2013, Swing First filed a supplemental Response to the Petition, reiterating the concerns stated in its April 19, 2013, filing.
- 12. On July 16, 2013, the Commission issued Decision No. 73992. Decision No. 73992 amended Decision Nos. 71854 (August 25, 2010) and 72579 (September 15, 2011) pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252. Decision No. 73992 adopted Staff's recommendation to increase the Company's rates to reflect recovery of income tax expense as requested by the Company, and to classify the income taxes as an imputed expense. Decision No. 73992 also adopted Staff's recommendation to require the Company to file a full rate case for both its water and wastewater divisions no later than June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar test year.

#### Rehearing Procedural History

- 13. On July 26, 2013, Johnson Utilities filed a petition for rehearing of Decision No. 73992 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-253. Johnson Utilities requested that the Commission grant its rehearing request for the limited purpose of modifying Decision No. 73992 to require a rate case filing by June 30, 2017, using a calendar year 2016 test year, two years later than the June 30, 2015 deadline using a 2014 calendar test year.
- 14. On July 31, 2013, RUCO filed an application for rehearing of Decision No. 73992 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-253. RUCO stated that it disagreed with Decision No. 73992 as a matter of public policy, and claimed that Decision No. 73992 violates Arizona's Constitution by increasing rates based on a new expense without a meaningful fair value analysis, citing to *Scates v. Ariz. Corp. Comm'n*, 118 Ariz. 531, 578 P.2d 612 (Ariz. App. 1978). RUCO also claimed that the manner in which Decision No. 73992 imputes the income tax expense is arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion, because the expense amount is not based on the Company shareholders' actual income taxes.
- 15. At the Commission's August 15, 2013, Staff Open Meeting, the Commission voted to grant both Johnson Utilities' and RUCO's requests to rehear Decision No. 73992 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-253; directed the Hearing Division to hold proceedings on rehearing and prepare a Recommended Opinion and Order for Commission consideration; but also directed that the rehearing

<sup>2</sup> Commissioner Bob Burns, who made the motion, explained that the purpose of his motion was to ensure that RUCO and Johnson Utilities would have the opportunity to address the matters raised in their applications for rehearing, and that they would not be foreclosed from pursuing any matter raised in their rehearing applications because of the Commission's prior determinations in this docket.

issue first be brought back to a future Open Meeting, in order to provide further direction to the Hearing Division.

- 16. At the Commission's September 11, 2013, Staff Open Meeting, the Commission voted to approve a motion to reopen this docket pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252, for purposes of considering whether to modify any Commission Decisions entered in this docket related to determinations in those Decisions that might be implicated by RUCO's and Johnson Utilities' applications for rehearing of Decision No. 73992, in order to ensure that RUCO and Johnson Utilities would have an opportunity to address the matters raised in their rehearing applications. The motion directed the Hearing Division to conduct proceedings and hold evidentiary hearings in order to take evidence in accordance with the *Scates* opinion and Arizona law.<sup>2</sup>
- 17. On September 20, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued setting a procedural conference to discuss procedural issues related to the rehearing of Decision No. 73992, including a schedule for the presentation of evidence in accordance with the *Scates* opinion and Arizona law.
- 18. On September 25, 2013, Swing First filed Notice that it would not be participating in the rehearing proceeding.
- 19. On October 4, 2013, Johnson Utilities filed Comments Regarding Rehearing of Decision Nos. 73992 and 73993.
- 20. On October 4, 2013, a procedural conference convened as scheduled to discuss the schedule for presentation of evidence in the rehearing proceeding in accordance with the *Scates* opinion and Arizona law. Johnson Utilities, RUCO, and Staff appeared through counsel and discussed the evidence to be presented.
- 21. On October 8, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued setting initial filing dates for the rehearing proceeding, in accordance with the discussion at the October 4, 2013 procedural conference.
  - 22. On October 17, 2013, Johnson Utilities filed tariffs in compliance with Decision No.

73992, with an effective date of July 16, 2013.

3

On November 4, 2013, Johnson Utilities and RUCO filed a Proposed Settlement 23. Agreement and Request for Modified Procedural Order, or in the Alternative, Request for Procedural Conference. A copy of the Proposed Settlement Agreement is attached hereto and incorporated

5

4

herein as Exhibit A.

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

24. On November 19, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued setting a procedural conference for discussion of an appropriate procedural schedule.

- 25. On December 5, 2013, a procedural conference convened as scheduled. Johnson Utilities, RUCO, and Staff appeared through counsel, and set forth their positions on the need for an evidentiary hearing and a possible hearing schedule.
- On January 17, 2014, Johnson Utilities filed Direct Testimony in support of the 26. Proposed Settlement Agreement of its witness Daniel Hodges, and RUCO filed Direct Testimony in support of the Proposed Settlement Agreement of its witness Patrick J. Quinn.
- 27. On January 22, 2014, a Procedural Order was issued. The Procedural Order noted that Johnson Utilities had filed with the Commission on December 31, 2013, in Docket No. WS-02987A-13-0477, an application for approval of the sale and transfer of all of its utility assets in Pinal County, Arizona to the Town of Florence, and for conditional cancellation and extinguishment of Johnson Utilities' Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("Asset Sale Application"). The Procedural Order set a procedural conference for discussion of an appropriate date for scheduling the rehearing of Decision No. 73992.
- 28. On January 30, 2014, a procedural conference convened as scheduled. Johnson Utilities, RUCO, and Staff appeared through counsel. Counsel for Johnson Utilities provided an update on activity related to the Asset Sale Application. The parties indicated no change in their positions regarding the need for an evidentiary rehearing, and discussed an appropriate date for its scheduling.
- 29. On February 10, 2014, by Procedural Order, the rehearing was scheduled for March 13, 2014, and associated procedural deadlines were established.
  - 30. On February 12, 2014, Staff filed Responsive Testimony of its witness Darron W.

Carlson.

- 31. On February 28, 2014, the Company filed Surrebuttal Testimony of its witness Daniel Hodges, and RUCO filed Surrebuttal Testimony of its witness Robert B. Mease.
- 32. The rehearing convened as scheduled on March 13, 2014. The Company, RUCO and Staff appeared through counsel, presented evidence through witnesses, and cross-examined witnesses.
  - 33. On April 18, 2014, Johnson Utilities, RUCO, and Staff filed Initial Closing Briefs.
- 34. On May 2, 2014, Johnson Utilities filed a Reply Closing Brief. RUCO and Staff each filed a Notice indicating that they did not intend to file Reply Briefs.
- 35. On May 19, 20, and 21, 2014, a hearing was held in Docket No. WS-02987A-13-0477 on the Asset Sale Application. On May 23, 2014, Johnson Utilities filed a motion in that docket requesting authority to withdraw the Asset Sale Application and closure of the docket, which was granted by Procedural Order issued June 18, 2014.

#### Rehearing Proposed Settlement Agreement

- 36. By their Proposed Settlement Agreement, the Company and RUCO request two modifications to Decision No. 73992: 1) a decrease in wastewater rates to reflect a reduction in the imputed income tax rate of 36.6558 percent approved by Decision No. 73992, down to 25 percent; and 2) a one year extension to the requirement that Johnson Utilities file a full rate case no later than June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar test year, to June 30, 2016, using a 2015 calendar test year.
- 37. In addition to the two modifications, the Proposed Settlement Agreement would add a new requirement that the Company file yearly earnings reports starting with 2013 by the last day of the following February for each year prior to the next rate case filing, in the form of the Schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.
- 38. The Proposed Settlement Agreement provides that within 30 days of Commission approval of the Proposed Settlement Agreement, Johnson Utilities will file a revised tariff for its wastewater division with the new lower rates resulting from a reduction in the rate for imputed income tax expense from 36.6558 percent to 25 percent, effective for all billings by the Company on and after the date of a Commission Order approving the Settlement Agreement.

#### Parties' Positions

- 39. The Company and RUCO agree to their two requested modifications to Decision No. 73992 only if the two modifications are made together.
- 40. Staff agrees to the decrease in wastewater rates proposed in the Settlement Agreement. However, Staff opposes the one year extension of time for the rate case filing. Staff states that it recognizes the benefit to ratepayers of the reduction in wastewater rates, and would like to see the two proposed modifications to Decision No. 73992 bifurcated. Based on Johnson Utilities' and RUCO's stated unwillingness to bifurcate the two modifications, and on Staff's opposition to the one year time extension for the rate case filing, Staff recommends that the Proposed Settlement Agreement not be approved, which would leave the requirements of Decision No. 73992 unchanged.
- 41. The Company and RUCO state that the Proposed Settlement Agreement fully resolves all disputed issues between the Company and RUCO, and that the terms of their Settlement Agreement provide benefits by:
  - reducing the Company's authorized imputed income tax rate from 36.6558 percent to 25 percent for the wastewater division, resulting in lower wastewater rates and combined annual savings for wastewater customers of approximately \$286,000;
  - requiring independent verification, prior to the filing of the Proposed Settlement
    Agreement, that the weighted average of the income taxes paid by all of the
    Company's shareholders for the 2007 test year was at least equal to or greater than
    25 percent;
  - requiring Johnson Utilities to file a rate case by June 30, 2016, using a 2015
     calendar test year;
  - requiring Johnson Utilities to file yearly earnings reports starting with 2013 by the
    last day of the following February for each year prior to the next rate case, using
    the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement
    Agreement; and
  - avoiding further litigation and costs for RUCO and Johnson Utilities.

- 42. RUCO contends that the terms of the Proposed Settlement Agreement are fair to both the consumer and to Johnson Utilities, and are in the public interest under the current Commission policy on income tax expense allowance. RUCO notes that under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, RUCO retains the right to challenge the imputation of income tax expense in future rate case filings.
- 43. In regard to the proposed one year delay in the rate case filing requirement of Decision No. 73992, RUCO contends that the \$286,000 annual savings to the Company's wastewater division ratepayers outweighs any potential harm associated with the later rate case filing. RUCO argues that the terms of the Proposed Settlement Agreement provide a bona fide benefit to ratepayers, and that Staff's proposed rejection of the terms of the Proposed Settlement Agreement should not be adopted.
- 44. The Company contends that the provision in the Settlement Agreement for a one year delay in the deadline set by Decision No. 73992 for the Company to file a rate case is reasonable. The Company asserts that the evidence in this proceeding supports the extension of time, based on the testimony of the Company's witness Mr. Hodson that Johnson Utilities plans to invest in significant plant improvements over the next two or three years. The planned improvements include a major wastewater treatment plant expansion and installation of new wells and water storage. Mr. Hodson testified that much of the planned construction will not be completed by the end of 2014, and that delaying the test year from 2014 to 2015 will allow the Company to include significant additional plant investment in its rate case filing.
- 45. The Company contends that Staff's position opposing the proposed one year delay in the rate case filing requirement of Decision No. 73992 is not supported by any formal or informal analysis. The Company argues that as opposed to the seven years between test years ordered in Decision No. 73992, the proposal in the Settlement Agreement would put eight years between test years, and that Staff did not demonstrate that a one year delay in the test year filing requirement would harm the Company or its ratepayers.

#### Resolution

46. The Commission is appreciative of the efforts put forth by the Company and RUCO to resolve their disagreements with Decision No. 73992. We also appreciate Staff's concerns regarding

that the benefits of the Proposed Settlement Agreement, as set forth in Findings of Fact No. 41 above, outweigh any potential harm associated with the later rate case filing.

- 47. Based on the rehearing record in this docket, it is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the Proposed Settlement Agreement.
- 48. Based on the rehearing record in this docket, we find that it is reasonable and in the public interest to modify Decision No. 73992 to: 1) decrease the Company's wastewater rates to reflect a reduction in the imputed income tax rate of 36.6558 percent down to 25 percent; 2) require Johnson Utilities to file a full rate case no later than June 30, 2016, using a 2015 calendar test year in lieu of June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar test year; and 3) require Johnson Utilities to file a yearly earnings report for 2013 no later than August 29, 2014, a yearly earnings report for 2014 no later than February 27, 2015, and a yearly earnings report for 2015 no later than February 29, 2016, using the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- 1. Johnson Utilities is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. Title 40.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Johnson Utilities and the subject matter of the application.
  - 3. Notice of the rehearing was given in accordance with law.
- 4. Based on the rehearing record in this docket, it is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the Proposed Settlement Agreement.
- 5. Based on the rehearing record in this docket, it is reasonable and in the public interest to modify Decision No. 73992 to: 1) decrease the Company's wastewater rates to reflect a reduction in the imputed income tax rate of 36.6558 percent down to 25 percent; 2) require Johnson Utilities to file a full rate case no later than June 30, 2016, using a 2015 calendar test year in lieu of June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar test year; and 3) require Johnson Utilities to file a yearly earnings report for 2013 no later than August 29, 2014, a yearly earnings report for 2014 no later than February 27,

DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

4

5

6

8

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28 2015, and a yearly earnings report for 2015 no later than February 29, 2016, using the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.

6. The rates, charges and conditions of service established herein are just and reasonable and in the public interest.

#### **ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Proposed Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit A is hereby approved.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Decision No. 73992 is hereby modified to decrease wastewater rates authorized for Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company, to reflect a reduction in the imputed income tax rate of 36.6558 percent down to 25 percent.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Decision No. 73992 is hereby modified to require Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company to file with the Commission's Docket Control Center, as a compliance item in this matter, a full rate case no later than June 30, 2016, using a 2015 calendar test year in lieu of June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar test year.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Decision No. 73992 is hereby modified to require Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company to file with the Commission's Docket Control Center, as a compliance item in this matter, on or before August 29, 2014, a yearly earnings report for 2013, using the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Decision No. 73992 is hereby modified to require Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company to file with the Commission's Docket Control Center, as a compliance item in this matter, on or before February 27, 2015, a yearly earnings report for 2014, using the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Decision No. 73992 is hereby modified to require Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company to file with the Commission's Docket Control Center, as a compliance item in this matter, on or before February 29, 2016, a yearly earnings report for 2015, using the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Settlement Agreement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company shall file with the Commission's Docket Control Center, as a compliance item in this matter, on or

1	before July 31, 2014, revised schedules of rates and charges for its wastewater division to reflect a				
2	reduction in the imputed income tax rate of 36.6558 percent down to 25 percent.				
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the revised schedule of rates and charges shall be effective				
4	for all service rendered on and after August 1, 2014.				
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Johnson Utilities, LLC, dba Johnson Utilities Company				
6	shall provide notice to its customers of the revised rates and charges, in a form acceptable to the				
7	Commission's Utilities Division Staff, in its next regularly scheduled billing.				
8	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other findings and requirements of Decision No. 73992				
9	remain in full force and effect.				
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.				
11	BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.				
12					
13	COLO (ICCIONED				
14	CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER				
15					
16	COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER				
17					
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, JODI JERICH, Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have				
19	hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,				
20	thisday of2014.				
21					
22	JODI JERICH EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR				
23	BALLEO II VE DIRECTOR				
24	DISSENT				
25	DISSENT				
26	TJ:tv				
27					
28					

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	JOHNSON UTILITIES, LLC
2	DOCKET NO.:	WS-02987A-08-0180
3 4 5	Jeffrey W. Crockett One East Washington Street, Suite 2400 Phoenix, AZ 85004 Attorneys for Johnson Utilities, LLC	
6 7 8	Craig A. Marks CRAIG A. MARKS, PLC 10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676 Phoenix, Arizona 85028 Attorney for Swing First Golf, LLC	
9 10 11	Daniel Pozefsky, Chief Counsel RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE 1110 West Washington Street, Suite 220 Phoenix, AZ 85007-2958	
12 13 14 15	James E. Mannato, Town Attorney TOWN OF FLORENCE P.O. Box 2670 775 North Main Street Florence, AZ 85232-2670	
<ul><li>16</li><li>17</li><li>18</li><li>19</li></ul>	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel Robin R. Mitchell, Staff Attorney Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007-2927	
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>22</li></ul>	Steve Olea, Director Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007-2927	
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>		
25		
26		
27		

The purpose of this Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is to settle all issues related to Docket No. WS-02987A-08-0180 to RUCO's Motion to Rehear Decision No. 73992. This Agreement is entered into by the following entities:

Johnson Utilities, LLC Residential Utility Consumer Office

These entities shall be referred to collectively as 'Signatories;" a single entity shall be referred to individually as a "Signatory."

- Will require the Company to file yearly earnings reports for the years 2013 and 2014 prior to the next rate case.
- Avoids further litigation and cost to both Signatories.
- Will not impair RUCO's right to challenge or the Company's rights to support future determinations regarding the imputation of income tax for limited liability companies, subchapter S corporations, and other forms of tax pass-through entities.

#### II. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 2.1 The Company shall provide verification prior to the filing of this Agreement with the Commission through an independent third party certified public accountant (CPA) that the weighted average of the income taxes paid by all of the Company's shareholders for the 2007 test year is at least equal to or greater than 25%.
- 2.2 The applicable income tax rate for purposes of determining the amount of income tax to be imputed shall be reduced to 25% for the Company's wastewater division. Within thirty days of Commission approval of this Agreement, the Company will file a revised tariff with the new lower wastewater rates. The new wastewater rates shall be effective for all billings by the Company on and after the date of the Commission order approving this Agreement. This Agreement shall not affect the rates for water service approved in Decision 73992, which shall remain in effect.
- 2.3 The Company shall file a yearly earnings report starting with 2013 by the last day of the following February for each year prior to the next rate case filing. The Company shall make such filings in the form of the schedules attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 2.4 The Company shall file its next rate case by June 30, 2016 and shall use the 2015 calendar test year.
- 2.5 If the Commission approves this Agreement, neither Signatory will thereafter challenge Commission's Decision 73992 for any reason,
- 2.6 The purpose of this Agreement is to resolve RUCO's Application and the Company's Petition and not to act as precedent and impair or impede in any manner either Signatory's right to challenge and/or support any future decision of the Commission in any other case on any of the issues that are the subject of this Agreement. The Signatories understand and accept that future positions of the Signatories in other cases on the same issues which are inconsistent or adverse to the positions taken by the Signatories in this Agreement do not constitute a breach of this Agreement for failure to support the terms and conditions of this Agreement, or any other reason.

#### III. COMMISSON EVALUATION OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

- 3.1 This Agreement will serve as a procedural device by which the Signatories will submit their proposed settlement to the Commission.
- 3.2 The Signatories recognize that the Commission will independently consider and evaluate the terms of this Agreement. If the Commission issues an order adopting all material terms of this Agreement, such action shall constitute Commission approval of the Agreement. Thereafter, the Signatories shall abide by the terms as approved by the Commission.
- 3.3 If the Commission fails to issue an order adopting all material terms of this Agreement, either Signatory may withdraw from this Agreement, and such Signatory may pursue without prejudice its respective remedies at law. For purposes of this Agreement, whether a term is "material" shall be left to the discretion of the Signatory choosing to withdraw from the Agreement.

#### IV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- 4.1 The acceptance by any Signatory of a specific element of this Agreement shall not be considered as precedent for acceptance of that element in any other context.
- 4.2 No Signatory is bound by any position asserted in negotiations, except as expressly stated in this Agreement. No Signatory shall offer evidence of conduct or statements made in the course of negotiating this Agreement before this Commission, any other regulatory agency, or any court.
- 4.3 Neither this Agreement nor any of the positions taken in this Agreement by any of the Signatories may be referred to, cited, and or relied upon as precedent in any proceeding before the Commission, any other regulatory agency, or any court for any purpose except to secure approval of this Agreement and enforce its terms.
- 4.4 To the extent any provision of this Agreement is inconsistent with any existing Commission order, rule, or regulation, this Agreement shall control.

- 4.5 Each of the terms of this Agreement is in consideration of all other terms of this Agreement. Accordingly, the terms are not severable.
- 4.6 The Signatories shall make reasonable and good faith efforts necessary to obtain a Commission order approving this Agreement. The Signatories shall support and defend this Agreement before the Commission. Subject to paragraph 3.2 above, if the Commission adopts an order approving all material terms of the Agreement, the Signatories will support and defend the Commission's order before any court or regulatory agency in which it may be at issue.
- 4.7. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts and by each Signatory on separate counterparts, each of which when so executed and delivered shall be deemed an original and all of which taken together shall constitute one and the same instrument. This Agreement may also be executed electronically or by facsimile.

RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE
1 Ant
BATURY
Title DIERTAR-RUCO
Date 10 30 3013
JOHNSON UTILITIES, LLC
10 ///
By MINAL APPLICA
Title Managual Heusey
Data 1/-/(+/17)

# EXHIBIT A

DECISION NO. \_\_\_

Johr	ison Utilities - WW Division			SCHEDULE NO. 1
	Base			
Doc	cet No			
		RATE	BASE	
	PLANT			
1	Plant in Service			
2				
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation  Net Plant			
4	Net Plant			
5	PEDITETIONS			
6	DEDUCTIONS  Advances in Aid of Construction			
7	Advances in Aid of Collisi deadh			
8	Consultrations in Aird of Commission (UCIACIA)			
9	Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC")			
10	Accumulated Depreciation of CIAC  Net CIAC			
11	NETCIAC		,	
12	Contamon Mator Domosit			
13	Customer Meter Deposit			
14	Customer Security Deposits			•
15	Casamiler Security Deposits			•
16	Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")			
17	Accommission Deserved modifie rances ( ADIT )			
18				
19 20	ADDITIONS			
21	Deferred Regulatory Assets (Liabilities)			• •
22	Detailed Regulatily . Does (200			
23	Allowance for Working Capital			
24	Allowards for the training and the			
25	Net Additions and Deductions			
26				
27	TOTAL RATE BASE			
28				
29				
30			••	
31	RATE OF RETURN			
32	Fair Value Rate Base - Ln 27 Above	•		
33				
34	Operating Income - Schedule 3 Ln 30			
35	•			
36	Current Rate of Return Ln 34 / Ln 32			
37				
38	Approved Rate of Return - Last Rate Case			
39	• •			
40	Number of Customers - Last Rate Case			
41	•			
42	Number of Customers - This Filing			

DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

#### Johnson Utilities - WW Division

Balance Sheet
Docket No.

SCHEDULE NO. 2

	BALANCE	

	WW DIVISION	DALANCE BALANCE	Street
1	CURRENT AND ACCRUED ASSETS		
2	Cash		
3	Working Funds		
4	Temporary Cash Investments		
5	Customer Accounts Receivable		
6	Notes/Receivables from Associated Companies		
7	Plant Materials and Supplies		
8	Prepayments		
-	Miscellaneous Current / Accrued Assets		
9	Total Current and Accrued Assets		
10			
11	FIXED ASSETS		
12	Utility Plant In Service		
13	Property Held far Future Use		
14	Construction Work in Progress		
15	Accumulated Depreciation - Utility Plant		• *
16	Non-Utility Property		
17	Accumulated Depreciation - Non Utility		
18	Total Fixed Assets		
19			
20	TOTAL ASSETS		
21			
22	CURRENT AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES	•	
23	Accounts Payable		
24	Notes Payable (Current Portion)		
25	Notes / Accounts Payable to Assc Company		
26	Security Deposits		•
27	Accrued Taxes		
28	Accrued interest		
29	Miscellaneous Current / Accrued Liabilities		
30	Total Current Liabilities		
31			
32	LONG TERM DEBT		
33			
34	DEFERRED CREDITS		
35	Unamortized Premium on Debt		
36	Advances In Aid of Construction		
37	Accumulated Deferred Tax Credits		
38	Contributions in Aid of Construction		
39	Less: Amortizations of Contributions		
40	Contributions in Aid of Construction - PHFU		
41	Accumulated Deferred Income Tax		
42	Total Deferred Credits		
43			
44	TOTAL LIABILITIES		
45	s, <del>-</del>		
46	EQUITY		
47	Common Stock issued		
48	Paid in Capital in Excess of Par Value		
49	Retained Earnings		
50	Proprietary Capital (Partnerships)		
51	Total Equity		
52	· •		
53	TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY		

DECISION NO.

Johnson Utilities - WW Division
Operating Income
Docket No.

SCHEDULE NO. 3

#### SCHEDULE OF INCOME

1	OPERATING REVENUES			
2	Metered Water Revenue			
3	Annualized Revenues from 40-252 Tax Case			
4	Unmetered Water Revenue			
5	Other Water Revenues			
6	Total Operating Revenues			
7				
8	OPERATING EXPENSES			
9	Salaries and Wages			
10	Purchased Water			
11	Purchased Power			
12	Sludge Removal			
13	Chemicals			
14	Repairs and Maintenance			
15	Office Supplies and Expense			
16	Outside Services			
17	Water Testing			•
18	Rents			
19	Transportation Expenses			•
20	Insurance Expense			
21	Reg. Commission Expense			
22	Bad Debt Expense			
23	Miscellaneous Expense			
24	Depreciation			
25	Taxes Other Than income			
26	Property Taxes			
27	Income Tax			
28	Total Operating Expenses			
29				·
30	OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)			
31				
32	OTHER INCOME (LOSS)			
3 <b>3</b>	Interest and Dividend Income			
34	Non-Utility Income	·	****	
35	Miscellaneous Non-Utility Income			
36	Interest Expense		<u> </u>	
37	Total Other Income (Loss)			
38				
39	NET INCOME (LOSS)			
40				-

DECISION NO.	

The purpose of this Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is to settle all issues related to Docket No. WS-02987A-08-0180 to RUCO's Motion to Rehear Decision No. 73992. This Agreement is entered into by the following entities:

Johnson Utilities, LLC Residential Utility Consumer Office

These entities shall be referred to collectively as 'Signatories;" a single entity shall be referred to individually as a "Signatory."

#### I. RECITALS

- 1.1 On September 15, 2011, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") established the rates for Johnson Utilities, LLC ("Johnson" or the "Company") in Decision No. 72579. Decision No. 72579 amended the rates that had been set for Johnson in Decision No. 71854 issued on August 25, 2010.
- 1.2 On March 8, 2013, the Company filed a petition to amend Decision No. 71854 under §40-252 to allow for imputed income taxes. On June 27, 2013, the Commission issued Decision No. 73992 which approved the Company's request to amend Decision No. 71854 to impute income taxes.
- 1.3 On July 26, 2013, the Company filed a Petition for Rehearing of Decision No. 73992 ("Petition") requesting the Commission to modify the rate case filing requirement in Decision No. 73992 to June 30, 2017, using a 2016 test year.
- 1.4 On July 31, 2013, the Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO") filed an Application for Rehearing of Decision 73992 ("Application") requesting that the Commission reconsider its decision to allow imputed income tax expense in the rates of Johnson.
- 1.5 The Commission subsequently granted both the Company's Petition and RUCO's Application. Thereafter, RUCO and the Company met for the purpose of settling the matter and arrived at an agreement ("Agreement"), as set forth herein.
- 1.6 The Signatories believe that this Agreement is a fair resolution to this matter and all things considered is in the public interest. The benefits include:
  - Independent verification that the Company's member's actual weighted average tax rate is at least equal to or higher than the imputed rate of 25% that the Signatories are agreeing to in this Agreement.
  - Will reduce the applicable income tax rate to from 36.6558% to 25% for the wastewater division.
  - Will require the Company to file its next rate case by June 30, 2016, using a 2015 test year as opposed to filing by June 30, 2017, using a 2016 test year as requested by the Company in its Petition.

- Will require the Company to file yearly earnings reports for the years 2013 and 2014 prior to the next rate case.
- · Avoids further litigation and cost to both Signatories.
- Will not impair RUCO's right to challenge or the Company's rights to support future determinations regarding the imputation of income tax for limited liability companies, subchapter S corporations, and other forms of tax pass-through entities.

#### II. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 2.1 The Company shall provide verification prior to the filing of this Agreement with the Commission through an independent third party certified public accountant (CPA) that the weighted average of the income taxes paid by all of the Company's shareholders for the 2007 test year is at least equal to or greater than 25%.
- 2.2 The applicable income tax rate for purposes of determining the amount of income tax to be imputed shall be reduced to 25% for the Company's wastewater division. Within thirty days of Commission approval of this Agreement, the Company will file a revised tariff with the new lower wastewater rates. The new wastewater rates shall be effective for all billings by the Company on and after the date of the Commission order approving this Agreement. This Agreement shall not affect the rates for water service approved in Decision 73992, which shall remain in effect.
- 2.3 The Company shall file a yearly earnings report starting with 2013 by the last day of the following February for each year prior to the next rate case filing. The Company shall make such filings in the form of the schedules attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 2.4 The Company shall file its next rate case by June 30, 2016 and shall use the 2015 calendar test year.
- 2.5 If the Commission approves this Agreement, neither Signatory will thereafter challenge Commission's Decision 73992 for any reason,
- 2.6 The purpose of this Agreement is to resolve RUCO's Application and the Company's Petition and not to act as precedent and impair or impede in any manner either Signatory's right to challenge and/or support any future decision of the Commission in any other case on any of the issues that are the subject of this Agreement. The Signatories understand and accept that future positions of the Signatories in other cases on the same issues which are inconsistent or adverse to the positions taken by the Signatories in this Agreement do not constitute a breach of this Agreement for failure to support the terms and conditions of this Agreement, or any other reason.

#### III. COMMISSON EVALUATION OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

- 3.1 This Agreement will serve as a procedural device by which the Signatories will submit their proposed settlement to the Commission.
- 3.2 The Signatories recognize that the Commission will independently consider and evaluate the terms of this Agreement. If the Commission issues an order adopting all material terms of this Agreement, such action shall constitute Commission approval of the Agreement. Thereafter, the Signatories shall abide by the terms as approved by the Commission.
- 3.3 If the Commission falls to issue an order adopting all material terms of this Agreement, either Signatory may withdraw from this Agreement, and such Signatory may pursue without prejudice its respective remedies at law. For purposes of this Agreement, whether a term is "material" shall be left to the discretion of the Signatory choosing to withdraw from the Agreement.

#### IV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- 4.1 The acceptance by any Signatory of a specific element of this Agreement shall not be considered as precedent for acceptance of that element in any other context.
- 4.2 No Signatory is bound by any position asserted in negotiations, except as expressly stated in this Agreement. No Signatory shall offer evidence of conduct or statements made in the course of negotiating this Agreement before this Commission, any other regulatory agency, or any court.
- 4.3 Neither this Agreement nor any of the positions taken in this Agreement by any of the Signatories may be referred to, cited, and or relied upon as precedent in any proceeding before the Commission, any other regulatory agency, or any court for any purpose except to secure approval of this Agreement and enforce its terms.
- 4.4 To the extent any provision of this Agreement is inconsistent with any existing Commission order, rule, or regulation, this Agreement shall control.

- 4.5 Each of the terms of this Agreement is in consideration of all other terms of this Agreement. Accordingly, the terms are not severable.
- 4.6 The Signatories shall make reasonable and good faith efforts necessary to obtain a Commission order approving this Agreement. The Signatories shall support and defend this Agreement before the Commission. Subject to paragraph 3.2 above, if the Commission adopts an order approving all material terms of the Agreement, the Signatories will support and defend the Commission's order before any court or regulatory agency in which it may be at issue.
- 4.7. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts and by each Signatory on separate counterparts, each of which when so executed and delivered shall be deemed an original and all of which taken together shall constitute one and the same instrument. This Agreement may also be executed electronically or by facsimile.

RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE
The
BYTHIN
Title DIERTAR - RUCO
Date 10/30/2013
JOHNSON UTILITIES, LLC
By VIII AI NOVIII A
Title Markanya Hewsey
Date //-//+/P

## EXHIBIT A

DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_

John	nson Utilities - WW Division			SCHEDULE NO.	1
Rate	e Base				
Doc	ket No		2.07		
		KAIE	BASE		
1	PLANT				
2	Plant in Service				
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation				
4	Net Plant				
5					
6	DEDUCTIONS				
7	Advances in Aid of Construction				
8				•	
9	Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC")				
10	Accumulated Depreciation of CIAC				
11	Net CIAC				
12					
13	Customer Meter Deposit				
14					
15	Customer Security Deposits				
16					
17	Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")				
18					
19					
20	ADDITIONS				
21	Deferred Regulatory Assets (Liabilities)				
22					
23	Allowance for Working Capital				
24					
25	Net Additions and Deductions				
26					
27	TOTAL RATE BASE				
28					
29			re-		
30					
31	RATE OF RETURN				
32	Fair Value Rate Base - Ln 27 Above				
33	e a reconstruction				
34	Operating Income - Schedule 3 Ln 30				
35	5 - + D				
36	Current Rate of Return Ln 34 / Ln 32				
37	A December 1 and December 1				
38	Approved Rate of Return - Last Rate Case				
39	March and Contains and Teath Date Con-				
40	Number of Customers - Last Rate Case				
41	At and a second				
42	Number of Customers - This Filing				

Johnson Utilities - WW Division

Balance Sheet
Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

 	 _	-

SCHEDULE NO. 2

#### WW DIVISION BALANCE BALANCE SHEET

1	CURRENT AND ACCRUED ASSETS		
2	Cash		
3	Working Funds		
4	Temporary Cash Investments		
5	Customer Accounts Receivable		
6	Notes/Receivables from Associated Companies		
7	Plant Materials and Supplies		
8	Prepayments		
•	Miscellaneous Current / Accrued Assets		
9	Total Current and Accrued Assets		
10	,		
11	FIXED ASSETS		
12	Utility Plant In Service		
13	Property Held far Future Use		
14	Construction Work in Progress		
15	Accumulated Depreciation - Utility Plant		
	Non-Utility Property	-	
16	Accumulated Depreciation - Non Utility	**************************************	
17	Total Fixed Assets	~	
18	TOTAL FIXER ASSETS		
19	TOTAL ACCETS	•	
20	TOTAL ASSETS		
21	CURRENT AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES		
22			_
23	Accounts Payable		
24	Notes Payable (Current Portion)		
25	Notes / Accounts Payable to Assc Company		
26	Security Deposits		
27	Accrued Taxes	<del></del>	
28	Accrued Interest		
29	Miscellaneous Current / Accrued Liabilities		
30	Total Current Liabilities		
31			
32	LONG TERM DEBT	·	
33			
34	DEFERRED CREDITS		
35	Unamortized Premium on Debt		
36	Advances in Aid of Construction	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
37	Accumulated Deferred Tax Credits		
38	Contributions in Aid of Construction		
39	Less: Amortizations of Contributions		
40	Contributions in Aid of Construction - PHFU		
41	Accumulated Deferred Income Tax		
42	Total Deferred Credits		
43	S.		
44	TOTAL LIABILITIES		
45	i de la companya de		
46	EQUITY		
47	Common Stock Issued		
48	Paid in Capital in Excess of Par Value		
49	Retained Earnings		
50	Proprietary Capital (Partnerships)		
51	Total Equity		•
52			
53	TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY		
دد	THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE		

DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

John	son Utilities - WW Division		SCHEDULE NO. 3
Ope	rating Income		
Docl	ket No		
	<u>schei</u>	DULE OF INCOME	
	·		
1	OPERATING REVENUES		
2	Metered Water Revenue		
3	Annualized Revenues from 40-252 Tax Case	<del></del>	
4	Unmetered Water Revenue		
5	Other Water Revenues		
6	Total Operating Revenues		
7			
8	OPERATING EXPENSES		
9	Salaries and Wages	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
10	Purchased Water		
11	Purchased Power	·	
12	Sludge Removal	<del></del>	
13	Chemicals		
14	Repairs and Maintenance		
15	Office Supplies and Expense		
16	Outside Services		
17	Water Testing		k .
18	Rents		
19	Transportation Expenses		•
20	Insurance Expense		
21	Reg. Commission Expense		
22	Bad Debt Expense		
23	Miscellaneous Expense		
24	Depreciation		
25	Taxes Other Than Income		
26	Property Taxes		
27	Income Tax		
28	Total Operating Expenses		
29	,		•
30	OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)		
31			
32	OTHER INCOME (LOSS)		
33	Interest and Dividend Income		
34	Non-Utility Income		
35	Miscellaneous Non-Utility Income		
36	Interest Expense	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4
37	Total Other Income (Loss)		
38	Come a anal marrie for the		
39	NET INCOME (LOSS)		

DECISION NO.